



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/820,057	03/18/1997	CHRISTOPHER TURNER	109026-0038	2455

21323 7590 12/18/2001

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

LEWIS, DAVID LEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

DEC 18 2001

Technology Center 2600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 33

Application Number: 08/820,057

Filing Date: 3/18/1997

Appellant(s): Turner et al.

Steven J. Frank
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed 11/14/2001.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

Art Unit: 2673

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-28 and 30-34 stand or fall together.

(8) *Claims Appealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

Art Unit: 2673

5220316	KAZAN	7-1993
5216530	PEARLMAN ET AL.	6-1993
5042917	FUJITA ET AL	8-1991
4741601	SAITO	9-1988

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-28 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in prior Office action, Paper No. 28.

Art Unit: 2673

(11) Response to Argument

Claim 1

Kazan teaches of an a first printed electrode, figure 4 item 17, an electrophoretic display media, column 3 lines 1-15, column 5 lines 30-35, column 6 lines 50-60, figure 4 items 12 and 13, a printed non-linear devices, figure 4 items 14 and 16, and a second printed electrode, figure 4 item 15, wherein the top and bottom electrodes intersect to form a matrix, wherein an applied voltage to the electrodes will electrically couple the nonlinear device to a first and second electrode via a bus bar electrode connection, figure 11 item 1. **Kazan lacks** the teaching of printing a display media over the printed nonlinear device to form the display. **Pearlman provides** the teaching that the construction of an encapsulated display media of the type suggested by Kazan can be formed by printing a first electrode, printing an encapsulated display media, and then printing a second electrode, column 10 lines 7-30. **Fujita teaches** of a conventional display media wherein unlike the printing techniques of Kazan and Pearlman, he teaches of a semiconductor technique for forming a display media wherein first an electrode is formed on a substrate layer, figure 11 item 3, next a nonlinear device is formed on top and adjacent to the first electrode, figure 11 item 2, next a display media is formed on top of said lower levels, including the nonlinear device and electrodes, figure 11 item 13, and finally the second electrode is formed on top of said display media, figure 11 item 11. **Because Fujita teaches of a conventional display system with a known layering structure**, as claimed by the Appellant, it would have been obvious to the

Art Unit: 2673

skilled artisan to produce such a layered structure by the printing techniques of Kazan and Pearlman, wherein a printable electronic display is formed by printing a first electrode onto a first substrate, as taught by Kazan and Pearlman, printing a nonlinear device over the first electrode, as taught by Kazan in view of Fujita, printing a display media over the nonlinear element, as taught by Pearlman in view of Fujita, and printing a second electrode over the display media, as taught by Kazan and Pearlman, as suggested by the conventional layer structure of Fujita. Therefore the Examiner maintains the invention as found in claim 1, would have been obvious to the skilled artisan. The Saito reference overlaps with the Fujita teaching and makes a insignificant contribution to the rejection.

The Appellant's two arguments suggest that 1) the claimed layer structure is absent from the Prior Art, and 2) the electrical coupling of the nonlinear device to the electrodes is absent from the Prior Art.

1) In response to the first argument, on page 8 line 7, the Appellant admits that a small portion of the nonlinear element extends over the lower display electrode. This is the very same portion the Examiner is using to support his argument. In order to have such an overlap, as admitted to by the Appellant, the electrodes would have to be deposited in order before the nonlinear device. Because the nonlinear device is deposited after the lower electrode it overlaps or in other words

Art Unit: 2673

is applied on top of the electrode. Therefore the Examiner maintains the nonlinear elements are printed over the electrodes.

2) In response to the second argument regarding the suggested absent electrical coupling of the nonlinear elements to the first and second electrodes, such a coupling is inherent to Fujita. Wherein the broad term of "electrically coupling" would include the coupling of the bus bar and lower electrode through the nonlinear device. This connection functions to couple the upper electrode through an applied electrical voltage used to operate the display media in order to make the display media contrast appear light and dark, functioning as many conventional display system behave. Therefore electrical coupling occurs in series from the required applied voltage connecting to the bus bar, which makes a physical connection to the nonlinear device, which then connects to the electrode on the one hand, as well as the applied voltage connecting to the second electrode the other. See figure 11 of Fujita. The inherent voltage source that is required for the circuit to function. Therefore Fujita teaches of the nonlinear device being electrically coupled to the two opposing electrodes as claimed.

Art Unit: 2673

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

DLL
December 14, 2001

Appeal Conference:
MZ
MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110-2704

Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner

Amare Mengistu